



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,224	04/01/2004	David E. Richardson	100111157-1	5369

22879 7590 10/30/2008  
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

JAIN, RAJ K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2416

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/814,224	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RICHARDSON, DAVID E.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RAJ JAIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-16,18-23 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-16,18-23 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **General Remarks**

Applicant's Appeal brief based on the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In Paragraph 00186 delete "and carrier wave signals" as this creates a non-statutory issue with regards to a computer readable medium. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 23, 25-30 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claims 23, 25-30 insert "storage" between "readable medium". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-23, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher et al (USP 6085243) in view of Hrastar (USP 7,359,676 B2) and further in view of Lewis et al (USP 6,421,719 B1).

Regarding claim(s) 1, 9, 16 and 23, Fletcher discloses a method of managing traffic in a first set of nodes of a computer network (fig. 1, each dRMON serves a number of nodes such as 52a, 52b etc.) having a first set of nodes (21a, 52b, 52c) and a second set of nodes (51a, 51b, 51c) comprising:

determining a source associated with an amount of network traffic over the first set of nodes (col 4 lines 11-52, col 6 lines 10-15) the dRMON monitors network traffic volume for each set of nodes), the source being outside a group of network elements assigned to the first set of nodes (Fig. 1, outside nodes consist of 52 d-g).

Fletcher fails to disclose automatically displaying an indication of the source in response to determining the source exceeding the threshold levels.

Hraster discloses providing network traffic alerts and automatic displaying of access points (nodes or sources) that exceed a given threshold (col 16 line 59- col 18 line 20, the threshold level can be defined for a group of network elements such a users or individual element (ie. station) as appropriate, if the threshold is violated than it can be displayed accordingly col 39 lines 55- col 40 line 63).

Monitoring and displaying network elements which exceed desired and/or specified system threshold levels allows for adjustment of output levels to compliance with reference points to maintain desired network traffic levels. Thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hraster within Fletcher so as to provide a reference point to achieve compliance for desired network traffic levels by all operating network elements.

Fletcher and Hraster fail to disclose a first set of nodes and second set of nodes being a VLAN.

Lewis discloses a first set of nodes and second set of nodes being a VLAN (Fig. 5B). The virtual LAN (VLAN) standard allows for grouping nodes into Logical LAN groupings on a single fabric. In a VLAN environment, packets are assigned to a particular logical LAN and the packet is constrained to stay within that logical LAN. This ensures that unicast packets cannot be received outside of a particular grouping. Broadcast and multicast packets from a given node with a virtual LAN are similarly constrained to remain within the virtual LAN. The traffic containment that VLAN's provide, along with the controlled distribution of multicast packets, can permit a greater number of end nodes to be supported on a fabric.

Thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lewis within Fletcher and Hraster so as to contain traffic within a specific group and allow for network flexibility of future growth as needed by adding additional nodes.

Regarding claim(s) 3, 11, 18 and 25, Fletcher discloses a user name associated with the source (Fig. 4, each user/source has a specific dRMON agent and therefore a user name associated for the specific source)

Regarding claim(s) 4, 5, 12, 19, 26 and 27, Lewis discloses reassigning the source to the first VLAN in response to determining the source either manually or automatic (col 14 lines 12-14). Reasons for combining same as for base claims.

Regarding claim(s) 6, 13, 20, and 28, Fletcher discloses traffic data is obtained using a network management protocol (col 4 line 65 – col 5 line 10, the RMON2 provides layer 2-7 network management protocol capabilities).

Regarding claim(s) Claims 7, 14, 21 and 29 Fletcher discloses using an RMON protocol (col 4 lines 31-67). RMON provides autonomous Network Management, and automatically tracks network traffic volume and errors for each MAC address seen on a segment and maintains a Host Matrix table of MAC address pairs that have exchanged packets and the traffic volume and errors associated with those address pairs.

Regarding claim(s) 8, 15, 22, and 30, Fletcher discloses determination of the source includes determining the top sources of traffic (Fig. 1, the dRMON Collector collects traffic data info. for each set of nodes). Fletcher fails to disclose a VLAN, Lewis discloses a VLAN network (Fig. 5B), and reasons for combining would be same as for base claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-23 and 25-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAJ JAIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2416

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

***/Raj K. Jain/***

*Examiner, Art Unit 2416*

*/William Trost/*

*Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416*